

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/830,044	06/21/2001	Stefan D. Beckers	DVP:102 US	9440	
24041	7590 09/23/2004	4	EXAM	EXAMINER	
SIMPSON &	SIMPSON, PLLC	•	DEL SOLE,	JOSEPH S	
	ILLE, NY 14221-5406		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1722		
			DATE MAIL ED: 00/22/2007	DATE MAIL ED: 09/23/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	A	<del>-</del>
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	M
Advisory Action	09/830,044	BECKERS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joseph S. Del Sole	1722	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 03 September 2004 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this applice  1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to ich places the application	o a on in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens of CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most parned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the d statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension the final Office action; or (2) as	on fee under s set forth in
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>03 September 2004</u></li> <li>CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF</li> </ol>	4. Appellant's Brief must be filed R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of	d within the period set for of the appeal.	orth in
<ol><li>The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b</li></ol>	ecause:		
(a) M they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simp	lifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):		-
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	l be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed am	iendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because:	or reconsideration has been cons	sidered but does NOT p	lace the
<ol> <li>The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.</li> </ol>	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were no	ewly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: 8.			
Claim(s) rejected: 2-8			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
B. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme			
0. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>	(-)(	Joseph S 9/20	10el 66
		9/20	109

## Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 009/830,044

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The claims set forth on 1/7/04 were limited to an extruder for blown film, however this limitation is broader than the further limiting recitation of "blown tubular film" as set forth on 9/3/04.

Continuation of 10. Other: The Examiner notes that the substitute specification is now proper and has been entered, thus obviating the previous objections to the specification. The Examiner also notes that had the amendments been entered, the objection to claim 8 of the Office action of 3/3/04, pertaining to its improper dependency, would remain. However, the 112 2nd rejection of claim 8 and the objection to the grammatical construction of the claim would be overcome.